

Appl. No. 09/998,082
Amendment and/or Reply
to the Office Action of 6 February 2006

Page 6 of 8

2. REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-5 and 7-15 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 14 and 15 are independent claims.

Unless indicated otherwise, claims are amended for non-statutory reasons: to correct one or more informalities, remove figure label number(s), and/or to replace European-style claim phraseology with American-style claim language.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of allowability of claims 6 and 7. Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 6, and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over *Philips* and also over *Tagawa*.

A proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) requires that **all** of the claimed elements be found in the applied art. If a **single** claimed element is not found in the applied art, a prima facie case of obviousness cannot be properly established.

The rejection of claim 1 is rendered moot in view of the present amendment thereto. Thus claims 1-5 and 7-13 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 14 and 15 are drawn to an apparatus and an article of manufacture, respectively. Claim 14 has been amended to include:

a processing device that includes a processor and a memory, the processor being configured to: "... restore the integrity of the content by reassembling the sections subsequent to the sections passing through the screening algorithm..."

Claim 15 includes: "...a machine readable medium containing one or more programs which when executed implement the steps of:...

restoring the integrity of the content by reassembling the sections subsequent

Atty. Docket No. US 010203

**Appl. No. 09/998,082
Amendment and/or Reply
to the Office Action of 6 February 2006**

Page 7 of 8

to the sections passing through the screening algorithm. "

Notably, the amended claims 14 and 15 include features similar to that of allowed claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that the applied art does not disclose at least the features of claim 14 and 15. Thus, claims 14 and 15 are believed to be allowable over the applied art.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicant(s) respectfully request(s) that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.


If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 50-0238 for any additional fees, including, but not limited to, the fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17.

Atty. Docket No. **US 010203**

Appl. No. 09/998,082
Amendment and/or Reply
to the Office Action of 6 February 2006

Page 8 of 8

Respectfully submitted,



William S. Francos, Esq.
Reg. 38,456

May 8, 2006
Valentine, Francos & Whitt, PLLC
Treeview Corporate Center
Two Meridian Boulevard
Wyomissing, PA 19608

(610) 375-3513

Atty. Docket No. US 010203